arXiv:1406.7580v2 [math.PR] 18 Sep 2014

Hypercontractivity for Functional Stochastic Differential Equations*

Jianhai Bao[b], **Feng-Yu Wang**[a),c)], **Chenggui Yuan**[c)]

[a)]School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

[b)]School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha 410083, China

[c)]Department of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, SA2 8PP, UK

jianhaibao13@gmail.com, wangfy@bnu.edu.cn, F.-Y.Wang@swansea.ac.uk, C.Yuan@swansea.ac.uk

September 19, 2014

Abstract

An explicit sufficient condition on the hypercontractivity is derived for the Markov semigroup associated to a class of functional stochastic differential equations. Consequently, the semigroup P_t converges exponentially to its unique invariant probability measure μ in entropy, $L^2(\mu)$ and the totally variational norm, and it is compact in $L^2(\mu)$ for large $t > 0$. This provides a natural class of non-symmetric Markov semigroups which are compact for large time but non-compact for small time. A semi-linear model which may not satisfy this sufficient condition is also investigated. As the associated Dirichlet form does not satisfy the log-Sobolev inequality, the standard argument using functional inequalities does not work.

AMS subject Classification: 65G17, 65G60
Keywords: Hypercontractivity, compactness, exponential ergodicity, functional stochastic differential equation, Harnack inequality.

1 Introduction

The hypercontractivity, first found by Nelson [12] for the Ornstein-Ulenbeck semigroup, has been investigated intensively for various models of Markov semigroups, see for instance [2, 6, 9, 16, 18, 19] and references within. However, so far there is no any result on this property for the semigroup associated to functional stochastic differential equations (FSDEs, or SDEs with memory).

*Supported in part by Lab. Math. Com. Sys., NNSFC(11131003, 11431014) and the 985 project.

It is well known by Gross (see [9]) that the log-Sobolev inequality implies the hypercontractivity. However, for SDEs with delay the log-Sobolev inequality for the associated Dirichlet form does not hold. Indeed, according to [16, Theorem 3.3.6], the super Poincaré inequality (and hence the log-Sobolev inequality) implies the uniform integrability of the associated Markov semigroup P_t for all $t > 0$, which is not the case for the Markov semigroup associated to SDEs with delay, since it is clear that in this case P_t is not uniformly integrable for t smaller than the length of time delay, see Remark 1.1(2) for details.

On the other hand, the dimension-free Harnack inequality introduced in [15] and further developed in many other papers is a powerful tool in the study of the hypercontractivity, which works well even for non-linear SPDEs (see e.g. [17, 11]). Recently, this type Harnack inequalities have been investigated in [21] for FSDEs. To derive the hypercontractivity and exponential ergodicity from the dimension-free Harnack inequality, the key point is to prove the Gauss-type concentration property of the unique invariant probability measure with respect to the uniform norm on the state space, which is, however, not easy for FSDEs. We will see that our proof of the exponential integrability is tricky (see the proof of Lemma 2.1).

Let $r_0 > 0$ be fixed, and let $\mathscr{C} := C([-r_0, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ be equipped with the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Let $\mathscr{B}_b(\mathscr{C})$ be the set of all bounded measurable functions on $\mathscr{C}$. Let $\{B(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ be a d-dimensional Brownian motion defined on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, a complete filtered probability space. Let σ be an invertible $d \times d$-matrix, $Z \in C(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $b : \mathscr{C} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be Lipschitz continuous. Consider the following FSDE on $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathrm{d}X(t) = \big\{Z(X(t)) + b(X_t)\big\}\mathrm{d}t + \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t), \quad X_0 = \xi \in \mathscr{C}, \tag{1.1}$$

where, for each $t \geq 0$, $X_t \in \mathscr{C}$ is fixed by $X_t(\theta) := X(t + \theta), \theta \in [-r_0, 0]$. Assume that

$$2\langle Z(\xi(0)) + b(\xi) - Z(\eta(0)) - b(\eta), \xi(0) - \eta(0)\rangle \leq \lambda_2 \|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2 - \lambda_1 |\xi(0) - \eta(0)|^2, \ \ \xi, \eta \in \mathscr{C} \tag{1.2}$$

holds for some constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. Then the equation (1.1) has a unique strong solution and the solution is non-explosive, see [14, Theorem 2.3]. Let P_t be the Markov semigroup associated to the segment (functional) solution, i.e.

$$P_t f(\xi) := \mathbb{E} f(X_t^\xi), \quad t \geq 0, f \in \mathscr{B}_b(\mathscr{C}), \xi \in \mathscr{C},$$

where X_t^ξ is the corresponding segment process of $X^\xi(t)$ which solves (1.1) for $X_0 = \xi$. The following is the first main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *If $\lambda := \sup_{s\in[0,\lambda_1]} \big(s - \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{r_0 s}\big) > 0$, then P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ, and the following assertions hold.*

(1) *P_t is hypercontractive, i.e. $\|P_t\|_{2\to 4} \leq 1$ holds for large enough $t > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|_{2\to 4}$ is the operator norm from $L^2(\mu)$ to $L^4(\mu)$.*

(2) *P_t is compact on $L^2(\mu)$ for large enough $t > 0$, and there exist constants $c, \alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\mu((P_t f) \log P_t f) \leq c\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t} \mu(f \log f), \quad t \geq 0, f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1.$$

(3) *There exists a constant $C>0$ such that*

$$\|P_t-\mu\|_2^2 := \sup_{\mu(f^2)\le 1} \mu\big((P_tf-\mu(f))^2\big) \le C\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}, \quad t\ge 0.$$

(4) *There exist two constants $t_0, C>0$ such that*

$$\|P_t^\xi - P_t^\eta\|_{var}^2 \le C\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}, \quad t\ge t_0,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{var}$ is the total variational norm and P_t^ξ stands for the distribution of X_t^ξ for $(t,\xi)\in[0,\infty)\times\mathscr{C}$.

Remark 1.1 (1) It is easy to see that an invariant probability measure μ of P_t is shift-invariant, that is, letting $\phi_\theta(\xi)=\xi(\theta), \theta\in[-r_0,0]$, we have

$$\mu_\theta := \mu\circ\phi_\theta^{-1} = \mu_0, \quad \theta\in[-r_0,0].$$

In fact, letting X_0 have law μ, then $X_{-\theta}$ has law μ as well for any $\theta\in[-r_0,0]$, so that $X_0(\theta)$ has the same distribution as $X_{-\theta}(\theta)=X_0(0)$; that is, $\mu_\theta=\mu_0$. Moreover, since the equation is non-degenerate, for any $t>0$, the distribution of $X(t)$ has a strictly positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. So, $\mu_\theta(\mathrm{d}x)=\rho(x)\mathrm{d}x$ holds for some measurable function $\rho>0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and all $\theta\in[-r_0,0]$.

(2) It is well known that when P_t is symmetric in $L^2(\mu)$, the L^2-compactness of P_t for some $t>0$ implies that for all $t>0$. This assertion is wrong in the non-symmetric setting. It is easy to see that in the present framework P_t is not uniformly integrable (hence, non-compact) on $L^2(\mu)$ for $t\in[0,r_0]$, since according to (1) $\mu_{-r_0}=\mu_{t-r_0}$ has full support on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and it is obvious that

$$P_tf(\xi)=\mathbb{E}f(X_t^\xi)=g(\xi(t-r_0)), \quad \xi\in\mathscr{C}, t\in(0,r_0]$$

holds for $f(\xi):=g(\xi(-r_0)), g\in\mathscr{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 provides a class of Markov semigroups which are compact for large t but not uniformly integrable (hence, non-compact) for small $t\in(0,r_0]$. Moreover, when $r_0=0$, assertions in Theorem 1.1 reduce back to the corresponding well known ones for SDEs without memory.

In applications, the following consequence of Theorem 1.1 is more convenient to use.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $k_1,k_2>0$ be two constants such that*

$$\langle Z(x)-Z(y),x-y\rangle \le -k_1|x-y|^2, \quad x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.3}$$

$$|b(\xi)-b(\eta)|\le k_2\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty, \quad \xi,\eta\in\mathscr{C}. \tag{1.4}$$

If

$$k_2^2 \le \frac{2(\sqrt{k_1^2r_0^2+1}-1)}{r_0^2}\exp\Big[\sqrt{k_1^2r_0^2+1}-1-k_1r_0\Big], \tag{1.5}$$

then assertions in Theorem 1.1 *hold for*

$$\lambda := \frac{r_0}{k_1 r_0 - 1 + \sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1}} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1} - 1)}{r_0^2} - k_2^2 \exp\left[1 + k_1 r_0 - \sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1} \right] \right) > 0.$$

Next, we consider a semi-linear model which may not satisfy conditions in Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2. Let $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ be the set of all real $d \times d$-matrices, and let ν be a $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$-valued finite signed measure on $[-r_0, 0]$; that is, $\nu = (\nu_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le d}$, where every ν_{ij} is a finite signed measure on $[-r_0, 0]$. Consider the following semi-linear FSDE

$$\mathrm{d}X(t) = \Big\{ \int_{-r_0}^0 \nu(\mathrm{d}\theta) X(t+\theta) + b(X_t) \Big\} \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\sigma, B(t)$ are as in (1.1), and b satisfies (1.4). Let

$$\lambda_0 := \sup \left\{ \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) : \ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \det\left(\lambda I_{d\times d} - \int_{-r_0}^0 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda s} \nu(\mathrm{d}s) \right) = 0 \right\},$$

where $I_{d\times d} \in \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ is the unitary matrix.

In particular, when $\nu = A\delta_0$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ and δ_0 is the Dirac measure at point 0, equation (1.6) reduces to the usual semi-linear FSDE:

$$\mathrm{d}X(t) = \big\{ AX(t) + b(X_t) \big\} \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t),$$

and λ_0 is the largest real part of eigenvalues of A.

Let $\Gamma(0) = I_{d\times d}, \Gamma(\theta) = 0_{d\times d}$ for $\theta \in [-r_0, 0)$, and $\{\Gamma(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ solve the following equation on $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathrm{d}\Gamma(t) = \left(\int_{-r_0}^0 \nu(\mathrm{d}\theta) \Gamma(t+\theta) \right) \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.7}$$

According to [13, Theorem 3.1], the unique strong solution $\{X^\xi(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ of (1.6) can be represented by

$$\begin{aligned} X^\xi(t) = \Gamma(t)\xi(0) &+ \int_{-r_0}^0 \nu(\mathrm{d}\theta) \int_{-r_0}^\theta \Gamma(t+\theta-s)\xi(s)\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \int_0^t \Gamma(t-s) b(X_s^\xi) \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \Gamma(t-s)\sigma \mathrm{d}B(s). \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

In what follows, we assume $\lambda_0 < 0$. By [10, Theorem 3.2, p.271], for any $k \in (0, -\lambda_0)$, there exists a constant $c_k > 0$ such that

$$\|\Gamma(t)\| \le c_k \mathrm{e}^{-kt}, \quad t \ge -r_0, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm of a matrix. Obviously, the optimal constant c_k is increasing in $k \in (0, -\lambda_0)$. If, in particular, $\nu = A\delta_0$ for a symmetric $d \times d$-matrix A, (1.9) holds for $c_k = 1$ and $k \in (0, -\lambda_0]$. In general, see Proposition 4.1 in the Appendix of the paper for an explicit estimate on c_k.

The second main result in this paper is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let P_t be the Markov semigroup associated to the equation* (1.6) *such that ν satisfies $\lambda_0 < 0$ and b satisfies* (1.4)*. If $\lambda := \sup_{k\in(0,-\lambda_0)}(k - c_k k_2 \mathrm{e}^{kr_0}) > 0$, where c_k is in* (1.9)*, then assertions in Theorem* 1.1 *hold.*

The following corollary follows immediately from Theorem 1.3 since when $b = 0$ we have $k_2 = 0$, and $c_k = 1$ when $\nu = A\delta_0$ for some symmetric matrix A.

Corollary 1.4. *In the situation of Theorem* 1.3*.*

(1) *If $b \equiv 0$, then assertions in Theorem* 1.1 *hold for all $\lambda \in (0, -\lambda_0)$.*

(2) *Let $\nu = A\delta_0$ for some symmetric $d \times d$-matrix A with largest eigenvalue $\lambda_0 < 0$. If $\lambda := \sup_{k\in(0,-\lambda_0]}(k - k_2\mathrm{e}^{kr_0}) > 0$, then assertions in Theorem* 1.1 *hold.*

To conclude this section, let us compare Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. The framework of Theorem 1.1 is more general by the generality of Z. On the other hand, the following example shows that Theorem 1.3 is not covered by Corollary 1.2, the comparable consequence of Theorem 1.1. Let $r_0 = 1$, $\nu(\cdot) := -I_{d\times d}\mathrm{e}^{-1}\delta_{-1}$, and $b \equiv 0$. Then,

$$\lambda_0 = \sup\left\{\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) :\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda + \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda-1} = 0\right\} = -1 < 0,$$

so that Corollary 1.4 applies to all $\lambda \in (0, -1)$; but Corollary 1.2 does not apply since $Z = 0$.

The next section is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2, while Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 3. Finally, in Appendix we present an estimate on c_k in (1.9).

2 Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2

Since (1.2) remains true for $\bar\lambda_1$ in place of λ_1, where $\bar\lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1]$ is such that $\lambda = \bar\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\mathrm{e}^{r_0\bar\lambda_1} > 0$, we may and do assume that $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2\mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1}$.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\lambda > 0$, then there exist two constants $c, \varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^\xi\|_\infty^2} \le \mathrm{e}^{c(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)}, \quad t \ge 0, \xi \in \mathscr{C}.$$

Proof. Since in our proof we need to assume in advance that $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^\xi\|_\infty^2} < \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $t \ge 0$, we adopt an approximation argument. Let

$$\tau_n := \inf\{t \ge 0 : \|X_t^\xi\|_\infty \ge n\}, \quad n \ge 1.$$

Then $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$. Consider the FSDE

$$\mathrm{d}X^{(n)}(t) = \{Z(X^{(n)}(t) + b(X_t^{(n)})\}1_{[0,\tau_n]}(t)\mathrm{d}t - \lambda_1 X^{(n)}(t)1_{(\tau_n,\infty)}(t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma\mathrm{d}B(t), \quad X_0^{(n)} = \xi.$$

Then the equation has a unique solution such that $X_t^{(n)} = X_t^\xi$ for $t \le \tau_n$. Therefore, for any $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|X_t^{(n)} - X_t^\xi\|_\infty = 0, \quad a.s. \tag{2.1}$$

Obviously, there exists a constant $C(n) > 0$ such that

$$\big\langle \{Z(X^{(n)}(t) + b(X_t^{(n)})\}1_{[0,\tau_n]}(t) - \lambda_1 X^{(n)}(t)1_{(\tau_n,\infty)}(t),\, X^{(n)}(t)\big\rangle \le C(n) - \lambda_1 |X^{(n)}(t)|^2.$$

Then it is trivial to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon_0 \|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} < \infty, \quad n \ge 1, t \ge 0 \tag{2.2}$$

holds for some constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$.

Next, let $\xi_0(\theta) = 0, \theta \in [-r_0, 0]$. By (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle Z(\xi(0)) + b(\xi), \xi(0)\rangle &\le 2\langle Z(\xi(0)) + b(\xi) - Z(0) - b(\xi_0),\, \xi(0)\rangle + |Z(0) + b(\xi_0)| \cdot |\xi(0)| \\ &\le c_0 + \lambda_2 \|\xi\|_\infty^2 - \lambda_1' |\xi(0)|^2, \quad \xi \in \mathscr{C} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_1' > 0$ such that $\lambda' := \lambda_1' - \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1'} > 0$. So, by Itô's formula,

$$\mathrm{d}|X^{(n)}(t)|^2 \le \big\{c_1 + \lambda_2 \|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 - \lambda_1' |X^{(n)}(t)|^2\big\}\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}M(t)$$

holds for $c_1 := c_0 + \|\sigma\|_{HS}^2$ and $\mathrm{d}M(t) := 2\langle \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t), X^{(n)}(t)\rangle$. This implies

$$\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' t}|X^{(n)}(t)|^2 \le |\xi(0)|^2 + \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' s}(c_1 + \lambda_2 \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2)\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' s}\mathrm{d}M(s).$$

Let $N(t) := \sup_{s\in[0,t]} \int_0^s \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r}\mathrm{d}M(r)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' t}\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 &\le \mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1'} \sup_{\theta\in[-r_0,0]} \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1'(t+\theta)}|X^{(n)}(t+\theta)|^2 \\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}\|\xi\|_\infty^2 + \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1'(s+r_0)}(c_1 + \lambda_2\|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2)\mathrm{d}s + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0} N(t) \\ &\le c_2(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2)\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' t} + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0} N(t) + \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' s}\|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{d}s \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$. By Gronwall's inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' t}\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 \le& c_2(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2)\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' t} + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0} N(t) \\ &+ \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}\int_0^t \big\{c_2(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2)\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' s} + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0} N(s)\big\} \exp\big[\lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}(t-s)\big]\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\lambda' := \lambda_1' - \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0} > 0$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 &\le c_2(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2) + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1'(r_0 - t)} N(t) \\ &\quad + \lambda_2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}\int_0^t \big\{c_2(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2) + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1'(r_0-s)} N(s)\big\}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le c_3\big(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2 + \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' t} N(t)\big) + c_3 \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s - \lambda'(t-s)} N(s)\mathrm{d}s \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \le \mathrm{e}^{c_3(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)}\sqrt{I_1 \times I_2} \tag{2.3}$$

holds for

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \mathbb{E}\exp\left[2c_3\varepsilon\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s-\lambda'(t-s)}N(s)\mathrm{d}s\right], \\ I_2 &:= \mathbb{E}\exp\left[2c_3\varepsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' t}N(t)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, below we estimate I_1 and I_2 respectively.

(a) Estimate on I_1. To avoid the singularity of reference probability measures discussed below when $t \to 0$, we extend the integrals to the larger interval $[-r_0, t]$. Letting $N(s) = 0$ for $s \le 0$, by Jensen's inequality for the probability measure

$$\nu(\mathrm{d}s) := \frac{\lambda'\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0}}{\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0} - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda' t}}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s \ \text{ on } [-r_0, t],$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\exp\left[4c_3\varepsilon\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s-\lambda'(t-s)}N(s)\mathrm{d}s\right] \\ &= \exp\left[\frac{4c_3\varepsilon(\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0} - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda' t})}{\lambda'\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0}}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s}N(s)\nu(\mathrm{d}s)\right] \\ &\le \int_{-r_0}^t \exp\left[\frac{4c_3\varepsilon(\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0} - \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda' t})}{\lambda'\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0}}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s}N(s)\right]\nu(\mathrm{d}s) \\ &\le \frac{\lambda'\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0}}{\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0} - 1}\int_{-r_0}^t \exp\left[\frac{4c_3\varepsilon}{\lambda'}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s}N(s)\right]\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

So, by Jensen's inequality and the Burkhold-Davis-Gundy inequality, there exists a constant $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^2 &\le \mathbb{E}\,\exp\left[4c_3\varepsilon\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s-\lambda'(t-s)}N(s)\mathrm{d}s\right] \\ &\le \frac{\lambda'\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0}}{\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' r_0} - 1}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\mathbb{E}\exp\left[\frac{4c_3\varepsilon}{\lambda'}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1' s}N(s)\right]\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le c_4\mathbb{E}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\bigg(\exp\left[c_4\varepsilon^2\mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1' s}\int_0^s \mathrm{e}^{2\lambda_1' u}\|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2\,\mathrm{d}u\right]\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le c_4\mathbb{E}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)}\exp\left[c_4\varepsilon^2\int_{-r_0}^s \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1'(s-u)}\|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2\,\mathrm{d}u\right]\mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned}$$

where we set $X_s^{(n)} = \xi$ for $s \le 0$.

Now, using Jensen's inequality as above for the probability measure

$$\frac{2\lambda_1' \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}}{\mathrm{e}^{2\lambda_1' r_0} - \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1' s}} \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1'(s-u)} \mathrm{d}u \ \text{ on } [-r_0, s],$$

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^2 &\le c_5 \mathbb{E} \int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)} \mathrm{d}s \int_{-r_0}^s \mathrm{e}^{c_5 \varepsilon^2 \|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 - 2\lambda_1'(s-u)} \mathrm{d}u \\ &= c_5 \int_{-r_0}^t \mathbb{E}\, \mathrm{e}^{c_5 \varepsilon^2 \|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \mathrm{d}u \int_u^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s) - 2\lambda_1'(s-u)} \mathrm{d}s \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_5 > 0$. Since $\lambda_1' \ge \lambda' > 0$, we have

$$-2\lambda_1'(s-u) - \lambda'(t-s) \le -\lambda'(t-u) - \lambda_1'(s-u),$$

so that this implies

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^2 &\le c_5 \int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-u)} \mathbb{E}\, \mathrm{e}^{c_5 \varepsilon^2 \|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \mathrm{d}u \int_u^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_1'(s-u)} \mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \frac{c_5}{\lambda_1'} \int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-u)} \mathbb{E}\, \mathrm{e}^{c_5 \varepsilon^2 \|X_u^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

(b) Estimate on I_2. A shown in (a), by the Burkhold-Davis-Gundy inequality and using Jensen's inequality for the probability measure

$$\frac{2\lambda_1' \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1' r_0}}{\mathrm{e}^{2\lambda_1' r_0} - \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1' t}} \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1'(t-s)} \mathrm{d}s \ \text{ on } [-r_0, t],$$

we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^2 &\le \mathbb{E} \exp\left[c_6 \varepsilon^2 \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1' t} \int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{2\lambda_1' s} \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{d}s \right] \\ &\le c_7 \mathbb{E} \int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{c_7 \varepsilon^2 \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \mathrm{e}^{-2\lambda_1'(t-s)} \mathrm{d}s \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

holds for some constants $c_6, c_7 > 0$.

Now, combining (2.3), (2.4) with (2.5), and taking $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 \wedge \frac{1}{c_5 \vee c_7}$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon \|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} &\le \mathrm{e}^{c_8(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)} \bigg(\int_{-r_0}^t \big(\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \big) \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)} \mathrm{d}s \bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\le \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)} + \frac{\lambda'}{2} \int_{-r_0}^t \big(\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \big) \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda'(t-s)} \mathrm{d}s \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c_8, c_9 > 0$. Equivalently,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' t} \mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon \|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \le \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2) + \lambda' t} + \frac{\lambda'}{2} \int_{-r_0}^t \big(\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon \|X_s^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \big) \mathrm{e}^{\lambda' s} \mathrm{d}s.$$

By (2.2) and $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} < \infty, \quad t \ge 0.$$

Then, by Gronwall's inequality,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\lambda' t}\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \le \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)+\lambda' t} + \frac{\lambda'}{2}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)+\lambda' s+\frac{\lambda'}{2}(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^{(n)}\|_\infty^2} \le \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)} + \frac{\lambda'}{2}\int_{-r_0}^t \mathrm{e}^{c_9(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)-\frac{\lambda'}{2}(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s \le \mathrm{e}^{c(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)}$$

for some constant $c > 0$. According to (2.1), the proof is finished by letting $n \to \infty$. □

Lemma 2.2. *For any $t \ge 0$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathscr{C}$, $\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2 \le \|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 r_0 - \lambda t}$.*

Proof. By Itô's formula, we have

$$\mathrm{d}|X^\xi(t) - X^\eta(t)|^2 \le \big(\lambda_2\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2 - \lambda_1|X^\xi(t) - X^\eta(t)|^2\big)\mathrm{d}t.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 t}|X^\xi(t) - X^\eta(t)|^2 \le |\xi(0) - \eta(0)|^2 + \lambda_2\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 s}\|X_s^\xi - X_s^\eta\|_\infty^2\mathrm{d}s.$$

So,

$$\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 t}\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2 \le \mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2 + \lambda_2\mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1}\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 s}\|X_s^\xi - X_s^\eta\|_\infty^2\mathrm{d}s.$$

Therefore, the proof is finished by Gronwall's inequality since we have assumed that $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2\mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1}$. □

Now, we introduce the dimension-free Harnack inequality in the sense of [15]. We are referred to [3, 7, 21] for more results on the Harnack inequality of FSDEs. Since results in these papers do not directly imply the following Lemma 2.3, we include a simple proof using coupling by change of measure introduced in [1]. By (1.2) and the Lipschitz property of b, (1.4) holds for some $k_2 \ge 0$ and

$$2\langle Z(x) - Z(y), x - y\rangle \le 2\langle b(\xi_y) - b(\xi_x), x - y\rangle + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)|x - y|^2 \le -k_1|x - y|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

holds for some constant $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ as required in Lemma 2.3, where $\xi_x(\theta) = x, \xi_y(\theta) = y$ for $\theta \in [-r_0, 0]$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (1.3) and (1.4) hold for some constants $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k_2 \ge 0$. Then, for any $p > 1, \delta > 0$, positive $f \in \mathscr{B}_b(\mathscr{C})$, and $\xi, \eta \in \mathscr{C}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\big(P_{t+r_0}f(\xi)\big)^p \le &\big(P_{t+r_0}f^p(\eta)\big)\exp\bigg[\frac{p^2\|\sigma^{-1}\|^2(1+\delta)}{2(p-1)}\Big\{\frac{2k_1|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2}{\mathrm{e}^{2k_1 t}-1}\\ &+\frac{k_2^2}{\delta}\Big(r_0\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2 + \frac{|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2(\mathrm{e}^{4k_1 t}-1-4k_1 t\mathrm{e}^{2k_1 t})}{2k_1(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1 t}-1)^2}\Big)\Big\}\bigg].\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $X_t = X_t^\xi$ and $Y(t)$ solve the equation

$$\mathrm{d}Y(s) = \bigg(Z(Y(s)) + b(X_s) + g(s)1_{[0,\tau)}(s)\cdot\frac{X(s)-Y(s)}{|X(s)-Y(s)|}\bigg)\mathrm{d}s + \sigma\mathrm{d}B(s), \quad Y_0 = \eta,$$

where

$$\tau := \inf\{s \geq 0 : X(s) = Y(s)\}$$

is the coupling time and $g \in C([0,\infty))$ is to be determined. It is easy to see that this equation has a unique solution up to the coupling time τ. Letting $Y(s) = X(s)$ for $s \geq \tau$, we obtain a solution $Y(s)$ for all $s \geq 0$. We will then choose g such that $\tau \leq t$, i.e. $X_{t+r_0} = Y_{t+r_0}$. Obviously, we have

$$\mathrm{d}|X(s)-Y(s)| \leq -\big\{k_1|X(s)-Y(s)| + g(s)\big\}\mathrm{d}s, \quad s < \tau.$$

Then

$$|X(s)-Y(s)| \leq |\xi(0)-\eta(0)|\mathrm{e}^{-k_1 s} - \mathrm{e}^{-k_1 s}\int_0^s \mathrm{e}^{k_1 r}g(r)\mathrm{d}r, \quad s \leq \tau.$$

Taking

$$g(s) = \frac{|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|\mathrm{e}^{k_1 s}}{\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{2k_1 s}\mathrm{d}s}, \quad s \in [0,t], \tag{2.6}$$

we see that

$$|X(s)-Y(s)| \leq \frac{|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1 t - k_1 s} - \mathrm{e}^{k_1 s})}{\mathrm{e}^{2k_1 t}-1}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq \tau. \tag{2.7}$$

In particular, this implies $\tau \leq t$ and thus, $X_{t+r_0} = Y_{t+r_0}$ as required.

Now, let $h(s) := \sigma^{-1}\big\{1_{[0,\tau)}g(s)\frac{X(s)-Y(s)}{|X(s)-Y(s)|} + b(X_s) - b(Y_s)\big\}$. We have

$$\mathrm{d}Y(s) = \big(Z(Y(s)) + b(Y_s)\big)\mathrm{d}s + \sigma\mathrm{d}\tilde{B}(s), \quad Y_0 = \eta, \quad s \in [0, t+r_0],$$

where, by the Girsanov theorem,

$$\tilde{B}(s) := B(s) + \int_0^s \langle h(u), \mathrm{d}u\rangle, \quad s \in [0, t+r_0]$$

is a d-dimensional Brownian motion under the weighted probability measure $\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q} := R\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$ with

$$R := \exp\bigg[-\int_0^{t+r_0}\langle h(s), \mathrm{d}B(s)\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{t+r_0}|h(s)|^2\mathrm{d}s\bigg].$$

By the weak uniqueness of the equation and $X_{t+r_0} = Y_{t+r_0}$, we have

$$P_{t+r_0}f(\eta) = \mathbb{E}[Rf(Y_{t+r_0})] = \mathbb{E}[Rf(X_{t+r_0})]. \tag{2.8}$$

Then, by Jensen's inequality,

$$(P_{t+r_0}f(\eta))^p = \big(\mathbb{E}[Rf(X_{t+r_0})]\big)^p \le (P_{t+r_0}f^p(\xi))\big(\mathbb{E}R^{\frac{p}{p-1}}\big)^{p-1}. \tag{2.9}$$

Noting that (2.7) implies

$$\|\xi_t-\eta_t\|_\infty^2 \le 1_{[0,r_0]}(s)\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2 + 1_{(r_0,r_0+t]}(s)\frac{(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t-k_1(s-r_0)}-\mathrm{e}^{k_1(s-r_0)})^2|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2}{(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t}-1)^2},$$

we obtain from (1.4) and (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|h(s)|^2 &\le \|\sigma^{-1}\|^2\Big(1_{[0,t]}(s)g(s)+k_2\|X_s-Y_s\|_\infty\Big)^2\\
&\le \|\sigma^{-1}\|^2\Big(1_{[0,t]}(s)(1+\delta)g(s)^2+(1+\delta^{-1})k_2^2\|X_s-Y_s\|_\infty^2\Big)\\
&\le 1_{[0,t]}(s)\frac{4k_1^2\mathrm{e}^{2k_1s}\|\sigma^{-1}\|^2(1+\delta)|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2}{(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t}-1)^2}\\
&\quad + 1_{(r_0,r_0+t]}(s)\frac{\mathrm{e}^{2k_1s}\|\sigma^{-1}\|^2(1+\delta)|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2k_2^2(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t-k_1(s-r_0)}-\mathrm{e}^{k_1(s-r_0)})^2}{\delta(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t}-1)^2}\\
&\quad + 1_{[0,r_0]}(s)\|\sigma^{-1}\|^2k_2^2(1+\delta^{-1})\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2 =: \gamma(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}R^{\frac{p}{p-1}} &\le \mathrm{e}^{\frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2}\int_0^{t+r_0}\gamma(s)\mathrm{d}s}\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{p}{p-1}\int_0^{t+r_0}\langle h(s),\mathrm{d}B(s)\rangle-\frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2}\int_0^{t+r_0}|h(s)|^2\mathrm{d}s}\\
&= \mathrm{e}^{\frac{p^2}{2(p-1)^2}\int_0^{t+r_0}\gamma(s)\mathrm{d}s}\\
&= \exp\left[\frac{p^2\|\sigma^{-1}\|^2(1+\delta)}{2(p-1)^2}\bigg(\frac{(\mathrm{e}^{4k_1t}-1-4k_1t\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t})k_2^2|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2}{2k_1\delta(\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t}-1)^2}\right.\\
&\qquad\qquad \left.+\frac{r_0k_2^2\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2}{\delta}+\frac{2k_1|\xi(0)-\eta(0)|^2}{\mathrm{e}^{2k_1t}-1}\bigg)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Combining this with (2.9), we finish the proof. □

Lemma 2.4. *If $\lambda>0$, then P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ such that*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}P_tf(\xi)=\mu(f):=\int_{\mathscr{C}}f\mathrm{d}\mu,\quad f\in C_b(\mathscr{C}),\xi\in\mathscr{C}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{C})$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathscr{C}$. Let W be the L^2-Wasserstein distance on $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{C})$ induced by the distance $\rho(\xi,\eta):=1\wedge\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty$; that is,

$$W(\mu_1,\mu_2):=\inf_{\pi\in\mathscr{C}(\mu_1,\mu_2)}\big(\pi(\rho^2)\big)^{\frac12},\quad \mu_1,\mu_2\in\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{C}),$$

where $\mathscr{C}(\mu_1,\mu_2)$ is the set of all couplings of μ_1 and μ_2. It is well known that $\mathscr{P}(\mathscr{C})$ is a complete metric space with respect to the distance W, and the convergence in W is equivalent to the weak convergence, see e.g. [5, Theorems 5.4 and 5.6]. Let P_t^ξ be the distribution of X_t^ξ. Then it remains to prove the following two assertions.

(i) For any $\xi \in \mathscr{C}$, there exists $\mu_\xi \in \mathscr{P}(\mathscr{C})$ such that $\lim_{t\to\infty} W(P_t^\xi, \mu_\xi) = 0$.

(ii) For any $\xi, \eta \in \mathscr{C}$, $\mu_\xi = \mu_\eta$.

It is easy to see that (ii) follows from (i) and Lemma 2.2. So, we only prove (i). To this end, it suffices to show that when $t \to \infty$, $\{P_t^\xi\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence with respect to W.

For any $t_2 > t_1 > 0$, we consider the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}X(t) &= \{Z(X(t)) + b(X_t)\}\mathrm{d}t + \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t), \quad X_0 = \xi, t \in [0, t_2], \\ \mathrm{d}\bar{X}(t) &= \{Z(\bar{X}(t)) + b(\bar{X}_t)\}\mathrm{d}t + \sigma \mathrm{d}B(t), \quad \bar{X}_{t_2-t_1} = \xi, t \in [t_2 - t_1, t_2]. \end{aligned}$$

Then the distributions of X_{t_2} and $\bar{X}_{t_2}$ are $P_{t_2}^\xi$ and $P_{t_1}^\xi$ respectively. By (1.2), we have

$$\mathrm{d}|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)|^2 \leq \big(\lambda_2 \|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_\infty^2 - \lambda_1 |X(t) - \bar{X}(t)|^2\big)\mathrm{d}t, \quad t \in [t_2 - t_1, t_2].$$

As in the proof of Lemma 2.2, this implies

$$\|X_t - \bar{X}_t\|_\infty^2 \leq \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 r_0} \|X_{t_2-t_1} - \xi\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t+t_1-t_2)}, \quad t \in [t_2 - t_1, t_2].$$

In particular,

$$\|X_{t_2} - \bar{X}_{t_2}\|_\infty^2 \leq \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 r_0} \|X_{t_2-t_1} - \xi\|_\infty^2 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t_1}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|X_{t_2-t_1} - \xi\|_\infty^2 \leq C := \sup_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\|X_t - \xi\|_\infty^2 < \infty.$$

Then

$$W(P_{t_1}^\xi, P_{t_2}^\xi) \leq \mathbb{E}\{1 \wedge |X_{t_2} - \bar{X}_{t_2}\|_\infty^2\} \leq C\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_1 r_0 - \lambda t_1},$$

which goes to zero as $t_1 \to \infty$. Therefore, when $t \to \infty$, $\{P_t^\xi\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a Chauchy sequence with respect to W. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. (a) We first prove that $\|P_t\|_{2\to 4} < \infty$ holds for large enough $t > 0$. Let $f \in \mathscr{B}_b(\mathscr{C})$ with $\mu(f^2) = 1$. By Lemma 2.3, for any $t_0 > r_0$ there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$(P_{t_0} f(\xi))^2 \leq (P_{t_0} f^2(\eta))\mathrm{e}^{c_0\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2}, \quad \xi, \eta \in \mathscr{C}.$$

By the Markov property and Schwartz's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_{t+t_0} f(\xi)|^2 = |\mathbb{E}(P_{t_0} f)(X_t^\xi)|^2 &\leq \Big(\mathbb{E}\sqrt{(P_{t_0} f^2(X_t^\eta))\exp[c_0\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2]}\Big)^2 \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}(P_{t_0} f^2(X_t^\eta))\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{c_0\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2} = (P_{t+t_0} f^2(\eta))\mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{c_0\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$|P_{t+t_0} f(\xi)|^2 \leq (P_{t+t_0} f^2(\eta)) \exp\big[c_1 \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2\big].$$

Let $r>0$ such that $\mu(B_r)\ge\frac{1}{2}$, where $B_r:=\{\|\cdot\|_\infty<R\}$. Then

$$|P_{t+t_0}f(\xi)|^2\exp\big[-c_1\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}(\|\xi\|_\infty+r)^2\big]\le 2|P_{t+t_0}f(\xi)|^2\int_{B_r}\exp\big[-c_1\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\big]\mu(\mathrm{d}\eta)$$
$$\le 2\int_{\mathscr{C}}P_{t+t_0}f^2(\eta)\mu(\mathrm{d}\eta)=2.$$

Thus,

$$|P_{t+t_0}f(\xi)|^4\le\exp\big[c_2(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t})\big],\quad t\ge 0 \tag{2.11}$$

holds for some constant $c_2>0$. On the other hand, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4 we have

$$\mu(N\wedge\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|\cdot\|_\infty^2})=\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{E}(N\wedge\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^0\|_\infty^2})\le\mathrm{e}^c<\infty,\quad N>0$$

for some constant $c>0$. Letting $N\to\infty$ we obtain $\mu(\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|\cdot\|_\infty^2})<\infty$. Therefore, (2.11) implies $\|P_{t+t_0}\|_{2\to 4}<\infty$ for large enough $t>0$.

(b) To prove Theorem 1.1(3), we let X_t, Y_t and R be in the proof of Lemma 2.3. By (2.8) and $P_{t+r_0}f(\xi)=\mathbb{E}f(X_{t+r_0})$, we have

$$|P_{t+r_0}f(\xi)-P_{t+r_0}f(\eta)|\le\mathbb{E}|f(X_{t+t_0})(R-1)|\le\sqrt{(P_{t+r_0}f^2(\xi))\mathbb{E}(R^2-1)}.$$

Take $p=2$ and $t=t_1>0$ such that $\|P_{t_1+r_0}\|_{2\to 4}<\infty$ according to (a). By (2.10) there exists a constant $c_1>0$ such that $\mathbb{E}R^2\le\mathrm{e}^{c_1\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}|P_{t_1+r_0}f(\xi)-P_{t_1+r_0}f(\eta)|^2&\le(P_{t_1+r_0}f^2(\xi))(\mathrm{e}^{c_1\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2}-1)\\&\le(P_{t_1+r_0}f^2(\xi))c_1\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\mathrm{e}^{c_1\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Hence, for any $t>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\xi)-P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\eta)|^2\le\big(\mathbb{E}|P_{t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)(X_t^\xi)-P_{t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)(X_t^\eta)|\big)^2\\&\le\Big(\mathbb{E}\sqrt{(P_{t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2(X_t^\xi))c_1\|X_t^\xi-X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2\mathrm{e}^{c_1\|X_t^\xi-X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2}}\Big)^2\\&\le(P_{t+t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2(\xi))\mathbb{E}\Big[c_1\|X_t^\xi-X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2\mathrm{e}^{c_1\|X_t^\xi-X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2}\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.2, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}&|P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\xi)-P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\eta)|^2\\&\le(P_{t+t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2(\xi))c_2\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\exp\big[c_2\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\big]\\&\le(P_{t+t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2(\xi))c_3\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\exp\Big[\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\Big]\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c_2,c_3>0$ and large enough $t>0$, where $\varepsilon>0$ is such that $\mu(\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|\cdot\|_\infty^2})<\infty$ according to (a). So,

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mu(|P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f-\mu(f)|^2)=\int_{\mathscr{C}\times\mathscr{C}}|P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\xi)-P_{t+2(t_1+r_0)}f(\eta)|^2\mu(\mathrm{d}\xi)\mu(\mathrm{d}\eta)\\&\le c_3\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\bigg(\int_{\mathscr{C}}\big\{P_{t+t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2\big\}^2(\xi)\mu(\mathrm{d}\xi)\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\bigg(\int_{\mathscr{C}\times\mathscr{C}}\exp\Big[\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|\xi-\eta\|_\infty^2\Big]\mu(\mathrm{d}\xi)\mu(\mathrm{d}\eta)\bigg)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\&\le C\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\mu(f^2),\quad t\ge 0\end{aligned}$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$, since by Jensen's inequality and that μ is P_t-invariant, we have

$$\int_{\mathscr{C}} \big\{P_{t+t_1+r_0}(P_{t_1+r_0}f)^2\big\}^2 \mathrm{d}\mu \le \int_{\mathscr{C}} (P_{t_1+r_0}f)^4 \mathrm{d}\mu \le \|P_{t_1+r_0}\|_{2\to 4}^4 \mu(f^2)^2.$$

Therefore, the assertion in Theorem 1.1(3) holds for large enough $t > 0$. Since P_t is contractive in $L^2(\mu)$, it holds for all $t > 0$.

(c) We now come back to the proof of Theorem 1.1(1). This assertion follows from (a) and Theorem 1.1(3) by straightforward calculations. Let $f \in L^2(\mu)$ with $\mu(f^2) = 1$. Let $\hat{f} = f - \mu(f)$. We have $\mu(P_t\hat{f}) = \mu(\hat{f}) = 0$. Let $t_0 > r_0$ such that $\|P_{t_0}\|_{2\to 4} < \infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu((P_{t+t_0}f)^4) &= \mu(f)^4 + 4\mu(f)\mu((P_{t+t_0}\hat{f})^3) + 6\mu(f)^2\mu((P_{t+t_0}\hat{f})^2) + \mu((P_{t+t_0}\hat{f})^4) \\
&\le \mu(f)^4 + 4|\mu(f)| \cdot \|P_{t_0}\|_{2\to 3}^3 \big\{\mu((P_t\hat{f})^2)\big\}^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&\quad + 6\mu(f)^2\mu((P_{t+t_0}\hat{f})^2) + \|P_{t_0}\|_{2\to 4}^4 \mu((P_t\hat{f})^2)^2 \\
&\le \mu(f)^4 + c\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\big\{|\mu(f)|\big(\mu(\hat{f}^2)\big)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \mu(f)^2\mu(\hat{f}^2) + \big(\mu(\hat{f}^2)\big)^2\big\}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ according to Theorem 1.1(3). Since

$$|\mu(f)|\big(\mu(\hat{f}^2)\big)^{\frac{3}{2}} \le \mu(f)^2\mu(\hat{f}^2) + \big(\mu(\hat{f}^2)\big)^2,$$

this implies that for large $t > 0$,

$$\mu((P_{t+t_0}f)^4) \le \mu(f)^4 + 2\mu(f)^2\mu(\hat{f}^2) + \big(\mu(\hat{f}^2)\big)^2 = \big\{\mu(f)^2 + \mu(\hat{f}^2)\big\}^2 = \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

(d) By e.g. Proposition 3.1(2) in [21], the Harnack inequality implies that P_t has a density with respect to μ for $t > r_0$. Thus, according to [22, Theorem 2.3], the hyperboundedness of P_t proved in (a) implies that P_t is compact in $L^2(\mu)$ for large enough $t > 0$. Moreover, according to [20, Proposition 2.3], the hypercontractivity implies the desired exponential convergence of P_t in entropy. Hence, Theorem 1.1(2) is proved.

(e) Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1(4). By the first inequality in (2.12), we have

$$\|\nabla_\eta P_{t_1+r_0}f\|^2(\xi) := \limsup_{s\to 0} \frac{|P_{t_1+r_0}f(\xi + s\eta) - P_{t_1+r_0}f(\xi)|^2}{s^2} \le c_1\|\eta\|_\infty^2 P_{t_1+r_0}f^2(\xi).$$

Thus, $|P_{t_1+r_0}f(\xi) - P_{t_1+r_0}f(\eta)|^2 \le c_1\|f\|_\infty^2\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2$. Combining this with Lemma 2.2 and using the Markov property, we obtain

$$|P_{t+t_1+r_0}f(\xi) - P_{t+t_1+r_0}f(\eta)|^2 \le c_1\|f\|_\infty^2\mathbb{E}\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty^2 \le c_2\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}\|f\|_\infty^2$$

for some constants $c_2 > 0$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Corollary 1.2. By (1.3) and (1.4), for any $s > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\langle Z(\xi(0)) - Z(\eta(0)) + b(\xi) - b(\eta), \xi(0) - \eta(0)\rangle \\
&\le -2k_1|\xi(0) - \eta(0)|^2 + 2k_2\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty \cdot |\xi(0) - \eta(0)| \\
&\le -(2k_1 - s)|\xi(0) - \eta(0)|^2 + \frac{k_2^2}{s}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_1(s) = 2k_1 - s, \lambda_2(s) = \frac{k_2^2}{s}$. Then Theorem 1.1 applies if there exists $s \in (0, 2k_1]$ such that

$$\lambda_2(s) < \lambda_1(s)\mathrm{e}^{-r_0\lambda_1(s)} = (2k_1 - s)\mathrm{e}^{-r_0(2k_1-s)};$$

that is,

$$k_2^2 < \sup_{s\in(0,2k_1)} (2k_1 s - s^2)\mathrm{e}^{-r_0(2k_1-s)}, \tag{2.13}$$

where the sup is reached at

$$s_0 = \frac{k_1 r_0 + \sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1} - 1}{r_0},$$

such that (2.13) coincides with (1.5) and Theorem 1.1 applies to

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &:= \lambda_1(s_0) - \lambda_2(s_0)\mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda_1(s_0)} \\ &= \frac{r_0}{k_1 r_0 - 1 + \sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1}}\left(\frac{2(\sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1} - 1)}{r_0^2} - k_2^2 \exp\left[1 + k_1 r_0 - \sqrt{k_1^2 r_0^2 + 1}\right]\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We first recall the following Fernique inequality [8] (see also [4]).

Lemma 3.1 (Fernique Inequality)**.** *Let $(X(t))_{t\in D}$ be a family of centered Gaussian random variables on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with*

$$\sup_{t\in D} \mathbb{E}|X(t)|^2 \le \sigma < \infty$$

for some constant $\sigma > 0$, where $D = \prod_{1\le i\le N}[a_i, b_i]$ is a cube in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let $\phi \in C([0,\infty])$ be non-decreasing such that $\int_0^\infty \phi(\mathrm{e}^{-r^2})\mathrm{d}r < \infty$ and

$$\mathbb{E}|X(t) - X(s)|^2 \le \phi(|t - s|), \quad s, t \in D.$$

Then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending only on $(b_i - a_i)_{1\le i\le N}, N, d, \phi$ and σ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in D} |X(t)| \ge r\right) \le C_1\mathrm{e}^{-C_2 r^2}, \quad r \ge 1.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let P_t be the Markov semigroup associated to the equation (1.6) such that ν satisfies $\lambda_0 < 0$ and b satisfies (1.4). According to the proof of Lemma 2.4, it is easy to see that (1.8) and (1.9) for some $k \in (0, -\lambda_0)$ imply that P_t has a unique invariant probability measure μ. Moreover, by taking $Z = 0$ and combining the linear drift with b, we see that Lemma 2.3 applies to the present equation for $k_1 = 0$ and some constant $k_2 > 0$.

Thus, following the line in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we only need to show that Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 apply to the equation (1.6) as well.

Let $k \in (0, -\lambda_0)$ such that

$$\lambda := k - c_k k_2 \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

It follows from (1.4), (1.8) and (1.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}|X^\xi(t) - X^\eta(t)| &\le \|\Gamma(t)\| \cdot |\xi(0) - \eta(0)| + \int_{-r_0}^0 \Big\| \int_{-r_0}^\theta \Gamma(t+\theta-s)\nu(\mathrm{d}\theta)\Big\| \cdot |\xi(s) - \eta(s)|\mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\Gamma(t-s)\| \cdot |b(X_s^\xi) - b(X_s^\eta)|\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le C_1 \mathrm{e}^{-kt}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty + c_k k_2 \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-k(t-s)}\|X_s^\xi - X_s^\eta\|_\infty \mathrm{d}s\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_1 \ge 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{e}^{kt}\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty &\le \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} \sup_{t-r_0\le s\le t} (\mathrm{e}^{ks}|X^\xi(s) - X^\eta(s)|) \\ &\le C_1 \mathrm{e}^{kr_0}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty + c_k k_2 \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{ks}\|X_s^\xi - X_s^\eta\|_\infty \mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

This, together with Gronwall's inequality, gives that

$$\|X_t^\xi - X_t^\eta\|_\infty \le C_1 \mathrm{e}^{kr_0}\|\xi - \eta\|_\infty \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}. \tag{3.2}$$

So, Lemma 2.2 applies.

Next, by (1.4), (1.8) and (1.9),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{e}^{kt}\|X_t^\xi\|_\infty &\le C_2(\|\xi\|_\infty + \mathrm{e}^{kt}) + c_k \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} k_2 \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{ks}\|X_s^\xi\|_\infty \mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} \sup_{(t-r_0)^+\le s\le t} \Big(\mathrm{e}^{ks}\Big|\int_0^s \Gamma(s-r)\sigma \mathrm{d}B(r)\Big|\Big)\end{aligned}$$

holds for some constant $C_2 > 0$. By Gronwall's inequality, this implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|X_t^\xi\|_\infty &\le C_2(\|\xi\|_\infty + 1) + \mathrm{e}^{kr_0} \sup_{t-r_0\le s\le t}\Big|\int_0^s \Gamma(s-r)\sigma \mathrm{d}B(r)\Big| \\ &\quad + C_2(\|\xi\|_\infty + 1)\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad + \mathrm{e}^{kr_0}\int_0^t \Big(\sup_{(s-r_0)^+\le u\le s}\Big|\int_0^u \Gamma(u-r)\sigma \mathrm{d}B(r)\Big|\Big)\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le C_3(1 + \|\xi\|_\infty^2) + C_3 \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)} \sup_{u\in[-r_0,0]} |Z_{s,u}|\mathrm{d}s\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$, where

$$Z_{s,u} := \int_0^{(s+u)^+} \Gamma(s+u-r)\sigma \mathrm{d}B(r), \quad s \geq 0, u \in [-r_0, 0].$$

Then, by Jensen's inequality for the probability measure $\frac{\lambda}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)}\mathrm{d}s$ on $[0,t]$, there exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon\|X_t^\xi\|_\infty^2} &\leq \mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon C_4(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)}\mathbb{E}\exp\left[\varepsilon C_4\bigg(\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)} \sup_{u\in[-r_0,0]}|Z_{s,u}|\mathrm{d}s\bigg)^2\right] \\ &\leq \mathrm{e}^{\varepsilon C_4(1+\|\xi\|_\infty^2)}\frac{\lambda}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}}\int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(t-s)}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\exp\Big[\frac{C_4\varepsilon}{\lambda}\sup_{u\in[-r_0,0]}|Z_{s,u}|^2\Big]\bigg)\mathrm{d}s, \quad \varepsilon > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

It is easy to see from (1.7) and (1.9) that

$$\sigma := \sup_{s\geq 0, u\in[-r_0,0]} \mathbb{E}|Z_{s,u}|^2 < \infty,$$

and there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|Z_{s,u} - Z_{s,v}|^2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\bigg|\int_{(s+v)^+}^{(s+u)^+} \Gamma(s+u-r)\sigma\mathrm{d}B(r)\bigg|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\bigg|\int_0^{(s+v)^+} \big(\Gamma(s+u-r)-\Gamma(s+v-r)\big)\sigma\mathrm{d}B(r)\bigg|^2 \\ &\leq c_1|u-v| + 2\|\sigma\|^2\int_0^{(s+v)^+}\|\Gamma(s+u-r)-\Gamma(s+v-r)\|^2\mathrm{d}r \\ &\leq c_1|u-v| + c_2|u-v|^2 \leq c_3|u-v|, \quad s\geq 0, -r_0 \leq v \leq u \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 3.1 with $N = 1, D = [-r_0, 0]$ and $\phi(r) = cr$,

$$C(\varepsilon) := \sup_{s\geq 0}\mathbb{E}\exp\Big[\frac{C_4\varepsilon}{\lambda}\sup_{u\in[-r_0,0]}|Z_{s,u}|^2\Big] < \infty$$

holds for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore, (3.3) implies the assertion in Lemma 2.1. □

4 Appendix

For application of Theorem 1.3, we aim to estimate the constant c_k in (1.9). Write $\nu = (\nu_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq d}$ for finite signed measures ν_{ij} on $[-r_0, 0]$. Let $|\nu_{ij}|$ be the total variation of ν_{ij}. For any $\lambda > \lambda_0$, define

$$\|\nu\| = \sup_{1\leq i\leq d}\sqrt{\sum_{1\leq j\leq d}|\nu_{ij}|([-r_0,0])^2}, \quad T_\lambda = 2\mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|, \quad \lambda^- = (-\lambda)\vee 0,$$

$$\rho_\lambda = \max_{\theta\in[-T_\lambda,T_\lambda]}\bigg\|\bigg((\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)I_{d\times d} - \int_{-r_0}^0 \mathrm{e}^{\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta}\nu(\mathrm{d}s)\bigg)^{-1} - (\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta-\lambda_0)^{-1}I_{d\times d}\bigg\|.$$

Proposition 4.1. For any $\lambda > \lambda_0$,

$$\|\Gamma(t)\| \le \Big\{ \frac{(\lambda-\lambda_0+1)\pi}{\lambda-\lambda_0} + \frac{4(|\lambda_0| + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|)}{T_\lambda} + 2\rho_\lambda T_\lambda \Big\} \mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}, \quad t \ge 0.$$

Proof. For any $z \ne \lambda_0$, define

$$Q_z = zI_{d\times d} - \int_{r_0}^0 \mathrm{e}^{zs}\nu(\mathrm{d}s), \quad G_z = Q_z^{-1} - \frac{1}{z-\lambda_0} I_{d\times d}.$$

We have (see [10, Theorem 1.5.1])

$$\Gamma(t) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{-T}^T Q_{\lambda+i\theta}^{-1} \mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)} \mathrm{d}\theta = \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{-T}^T \Big(G_{\lambda+i\theta} + \frac{I_{d\times d}}{\lambda-\lambda_0+\mathrm{i}\theta} \Big) \mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)} \mathrm{d}\theta, \quad \lambda > \lambda_0. \tag{4.1}$$

Obviously, $\big\| \int_{-r_0}^0 \mathrm{e}^{(\lambda+\mathrm{i}T)s}\nu(\mathrm{d}s) \big\| \le \mathrm{e}^{r_0\lambda^-}\|v\|$ and

$$\sqrt{1+\lambda^2 T^{-2}} - \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|}{|T|} \ge \frac{1}{2}, \quad |T| \ge T_\lambda.$$

Then

$$\|Q_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}T}^{-1}\| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^2+T^2} - \mathrm{e}^{|\lambda| r_0}\|\nu\|} \le \frac{2}{|T|}, \quad |T| \ge T_\lambda.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}T}\| &\le \|Q_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}T}^{-1}\| \cdot \left\| \frac{\int_{-r_0}^0 \mathrm{e}^{(\lambda+\mathrm{i}T)s}\nu(\mathrm{d}s) - \lambda_0 I_{d\times d}}{\lambda+\mathrm{i}T-\lambda_0} \right\| \\ &\le \frac{2(|\lambda_0| + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|)}{|T|\sqrt{(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2+T^2}} \le \frac{2(|\lambda_0| + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|)}{T^2}, \quad |T| \ge T_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $T \ge T_\lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T^T \|G_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta}\mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)}\|\mathrm{d}\theta &= \int_{-T_\lambda}^{T_\lambda} \|G_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta}\mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)}\|\mathrm{d}\theta + \int_{|\theta|>T_\lambda} \|G_{\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta}\mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)}\|\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &\le 2\rho_\lambda T_\lambda \mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} + \frac{4(|\lambda_0| + \mathrm{e}^{\lambda^- r_0}\|\nu\|)\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}}{T_\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)}}{\lambda-\lambda_0+\mathrm{i}\theta}\,\mathrm{d}\theta &= i\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{(\lambda-\lambda_0)\mathrm{e}^{it\theta}}{(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2+\theta^2}\mathrm{d}\theta - \mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} \lim_{T\to\infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\theta \mathrm{e}^{it\theta}}{(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2+\theta^2}\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &=: \Theta_1 + \Theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\|\Theta_1\| \leq \frac{2\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}}{\lambda-\lambda_0}\lim_{T\to\infty}\arctan\Big(\frac{\theta}{\lambda-\lambda_0}\Big)\Big|_0^T = \frac{\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}}{\lambda-\lambda_0}.$$

Moreover, by the residue theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Theta_2\| &= \Big| -2\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} i\mathrm{Res}\Big[\frac{z\mathrm{e}^{itz}}{(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2+z^2}, (\lambda-\lambda_0)i\Big]\Big| \\
&= \Big| -2\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} i \lim_{z\to(\lambda-\lambda_0)i}(z-(\lambda-\lambda_0)i)\times\frac{z\mathrm{e}^{itz}}{(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2+z^2}\Big| \\
&= \Big| -2\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} i \lim_{z\to(\lambda-\lambda_0)i}\frac{z\mathrm{e}^{itz}}{2(\lambda-\lambda_0)i}\Big| \\
&= \Big| -2\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t} i\frac{(\lambda-\lambda_0)i\mathrm{e}^{-t(\lambda-\lambda_0)}}{2(\lambda-\lambda_0)i}\Big| \\
&= \pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda_0 t} \leq \pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we arrive at

$$\Big|\lim_{T\to\infty}\int_{-T}^{T}\frac{\mathrm{e}^{t(\lambda+\mathrm{i}\theta)}}{\lambda-\lambda_0+\mathrm{i}\theta}\mathrm{d}\theta\Big| \leq \frac{(\lambda-\lambda_0+1)\pi\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}}{\lambda-\lambda_0}. \tag{4.3}$$

Combing this with (4.2) and (4.1), we finish the proof.

□

References

[1] M. Arnaudon, A. Thalmaier, F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack inequality and heat kernel estimates on manifolds with curvature unbounded below,* Bull. Sci. Math. 130 (2006), 223–233.

[2] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators,* Springer, 2013, Berlin.

[3] J. Bao, F.-Y. Wang. C. Yuan, *Bismut formulae and applications for functional SPDEs,* Bull. Sci. Math. 137 (2013), 509–522.

[4] S. M. Berman, *An asymptotic bound for the tail of the distribution of maximum of a Gaussian process with stationary increaments,* Ann. Inst. H. Poinc. Probab. Stat. 21(1985), 47–57.

[5] M.-F. Chen, *From Markov Chains to Non-Equilibrium Particle Systems,* World Scientific, 1992, Singapore.

[6] E. B. Davies, *Heat Kernels and Spectral Theory,* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

[7] A. Es-Sarhir, M.-K. von Renesse, M. Scheutzow, *Harnack inequality for functional SDEs with bounded memory,* Electron. Commun. Probab. 14 (2009), 560–565.

[8] X. Fernique, *Régularité des trajectoires des fonctions aléatoires Gaussiennes,* In: Ecole d'été des Probabilités de St-Flour, IV-1974. Lect. Notes Math. 480, pp. 1–96, Springer, Berlin, 1975.

[9] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and contractivity properties of semigroups,* Lecture Notes in Math. 1563, Springer-Verlag, 1993.

[10] J. K. Hale, S. M. Verduyn Lunel, *Introduction to Functional Differential Equations,* Springer, 1993, Berlin.

[11] W. Liu, *Harnack inequality and applications for stochastic evolution equations with monotone drifts,* J. Evol. Equ. 9 (2009), 747–770.

[12] E. Nelson, *The free Markov field,* J. Funct. Anal. 12 (1973), 211–227.

[13] Reiβ, M., Riedle, M., van Gaans, O., *Delay differential equations driven by Lévy processes: stationarity and Feller properties,* Stochastic Process. Appl. 116 (2006), 1409–1432.

[14] M. K. R. Scheutzow, M. K. von Renesse, *Existence and uniqueness of solutions of stochastic functional differential equations,* Random Oper. Stoch. Equ. 18 (2010), no. 3, 267-284.

[15] F.-Y. Wang, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds,* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 109 (1997), 417–424.

[16] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Theory,* Science Press, 2005, Beijing.

[17] F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack inequality and applications for stochastic generalized porous media equations,* Ann. Probab. 35 (2007), 1333–1350.

[18] F.-Y. Wang, *Analysis for Diffusion Processes on Riemannian Manifolds,* World Scientific, 2013, Singapore.

[19] F.-Y. Wang, *Harnack Inequalities and Applications for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations,* Springer, 2013, Berlin.

[20] F.-Y. Wang, *Hypercontractivity for stochastic Hamiltonian systems,* arXiv: arXiv:1409.1995.

[21] F.-Y. Wang, C. Yuan, *Harnack inequalities for functional SDEs with multiplicative noise and applications,* Stochastic Process. Appl. 121 (2011), 2692–2710.

[22] L. Wu, *Uniformly integrable operators and large deviations for Markov processes,* J. Funct. Anal. 172 (2000), 301–376.